

Stayton Downtown Urban Renewal Agency
MEETING MINUTES
June 1, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT

James Loftus	Scott Vigil
Steve Frank	Don Walters
Michelle Wonderling	Michael Schultz
Shannon Turerk	Catherine Hemshorn

STAFF: Don Eubank, City Administrator
Dan Fleishman, Director of Planning and Development
Dave Kinney, Public Works Director
Christine Shaffer, Finance Director

OTHERS: Charles Kupper, Consultant
John Spencer, Consultant

1. Introduction of members and selection of Chairman and Secretary

As Council President, Don Walters opened the meeting at 6:45. Members introduced themselves. Dan Fleishman indicated the need to elect a chairman and a secretary. Walters asked if there were any nominations for the Chairman position. Shannon Turerk nominated Scott Vigil as Chairman. James Loftus nominated Shannon Turerk. Turerk declined the position. Michelle Wonderling seconded the nomination of Vigil. Nomination passed unanimously. Vigil assumed the Chair.

Loftus nominated and Vigil seconded Michelle Wonderling as secretary. Nomination passed unanimously.

2. Review of draft Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and Report

Fleishman began a presentation of the Urban Renewal Plan and the Report on the Plan. Fleishman explained that Urban Renewal is a method of financing public improvements. State law requires before establishing an Urban Renewal district, a plan and a report about that plan must be prepared. In the summer, the Council appointed an advisory committee to assist in preparation of that plan. Vigil and Wonderling were members of that committee. The committee hired as consultants, John Spencer and Charles Kupper, to assist in the process. Fleishman indicated they were present to answer any questions.

Fleishman further explained that prior to the posting of the public hearing, a notice was sent to Marion County about the plan and that the City has received no comments from the County. At the time of the advisory committee was established a notice was sent to all of the other taxing jurisdictions, the Regional Library, the community college, the fire district, the school district, the city and the soil and water conservation district, informing them we were going to be starting this effort and asking them to participate. The school district and the fire district sent representatives that were members of the committee. All other taxing

jurisdictions were sent written notices of the hearing that the City Council will be holding, and no comments have been received from those organizations.

The statute requires that the draft plan be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Commission reviewed the Plan at their April meeting and unanimously recommended that the council adopt the plan.

Fleishman explained that the proposed Urban Renewal Plan has been established for three basic categories of activities: financing public improvements, utilities, streetscaping; stimulating private property development through loans or grants for property improvements; and promotion and marketing and of the downtown area. Urban Renewal is financed through the property taxes that are placed on new increments of value so that as the valuation of the new district grows the revenue to the Urban Renewal agency grows, but it does not affect the amount of tax that any individual property owner pays. It affects how those taxes are divided by Marion County.

Turk questioned that if the agency approves the Plan, in terms of the allocation of funds, does that mean the plan is set in stone, or can the plan be amended? Fleishman replied that the plan contains an estimate of revenue available to the agency over the next twenty years. It sets some targets as how that money will be spent in various categories, but it does not specify specific projects that will be done. Secondly, there is a provision in the plan that talks about how the plan can be amended.

Turk asked if the size of the Urban Renewal Plan is set, and Fleishman replied yes it is. Also set is the total bonded indebtedness is set.

James Loftus stated, based upon Fleishman's reply, if the Agency adopts the plan in its current format and make a recommendation to the Council to accept it, the Agency will be done with it in its current condition. He expressed concerns with portions of the plan, including the reference to prohibiting automobile oriented uses and having 8 to 10 foot sidewalks. Loftus feels if this plan the way it is currently written, there will be some issues with existing property, his own property and existing businesses.

Steve Frank asked if there are proposed amendments to the proposed plan, would it be appropriate for the Agency to modify it or would be more appropriate for the Council to change it? Fleishman advised that technically the proposal is being sent from the Agency to the City Council for adoption, so yes, if a majority of the Agency members feel that there should be some modification then that can be done before or after the council approves it.

Frank asked if it would be more appropriate to have an agency meeting to discuss the issues at hand, rather than have a five minute meeting before the council meeting?

Chairman Vigil stated that there is some confusion as far as the Agency is considered. This is the first meeting as an Agency and they have not discussed anything or looked over the plan and it is expected to be recommended to the Council tonight.

Loftus asked what happens if the plan is not adopted tonight, if it is deferred to a second meeting? Fleishman advised the ramifications of that is that it essentially pushes back the effective date of the Urban Renewal for a year by determining which year of assessment is used as the frozen base. Loftus asked what if it is adopted next week? Fleishman advised he believes the public hearing has to be publicized again, if the council does not hold the public

hearing tonight and adopt it tonight, the whole notice procedure would have to be done again.

Loftus stated that if the agency meeting meets next week, discusses it, and puts it into the next council meeting, that would give appropriate public hearing notice. Charles Kupper advised that the Agency members could choose not to have Council action tonight, but want to have a separate Agency meeting to discuss the issues. One concern is that there is a requirement of state law that of the Council hearing must be sent to everyone in the community. He was concerned about holding over the hearing to another date without need for a new notice. Kupper stated that the Agency could choose to move this along to the Council as is tonight, and then work with the Council to amend the plan later.

Kupper explained that the deadline for Council approval is the last meeting of August. Until the last Council meeting of August, you can still take advantage of the January 1, 2008 frozen base value.

Loftus asked about prohibiting automobile oriented uses or not allowing them? Fleishman replied that is in the plan, in the section of the plan that is merely a description of the current land use controls in effect today, adopted by the city council as part of the land use and development code. The plan contains a description of the existing zoning and the types of uses that are permitted in those zones today. The plan itself does not regulate land use.

Loftus advised the section he is looking at says "Proposed Land Uses." Fleishman replied before the description of the Commercial Core Mix Use zone that Loftus is referring to the is a paragraph that describes that the use and development of land in the Renewal Area shall be in accordance with the regulations described in the City's Comprehensive Plan and Land Use and Development Code. Then it goes on to describe the zoning classifications that are in effect today.

Kupper amplified on Fleishman's remarks, that the City could not adopt an Urban Renewal Plan that imposed conditions that were counter to existing zoning and comprehensive plan policies, so the cities code on zoning etc, governs absolutely. A renewal plan has no precedence over those codes.

Walters stated if the Agency is just starting on the process; that there is stuff in the plan, but that will be looked at when it applies and when there is money to fund it which can be a year, two or three down the road. He continued that tonight, the Agency is just voting on the fact that it wants to do this and it wants to have money funded to fixing up our down town. We are not really coming down with something that we do not have time to change.

Fleishman responded saying that is correct. The descriptions in the plan are pretty general. Three, four or five years is probably optimistic. The descriptions that are in here are based on the Downtown Revitalization and Transportation Plan that the Council adopted. He continued that one of the things staff has talked to about as an early project for the Agency is to begin to formalize some of the design principles that would then be put into place for when the time comes to be making those improvements.

City Administrator Don Eubank advised it looks like the Agency wants a work session. If we have until August to do this, we can postpone the hearing until the second meeting of July and in the meantime set up a work shop with the Agency.

Chairman Vigil said he thinks it is the right thing. If a work session could be set up that would be great. All agreed to a work session.

Wonderling started she would like to advise that the consultants are here tonight at quite an expense to the city.

Vigil asked if they could get into some discussion about the Urban Renewal Plan with the consultants. Fleishman advised if the Council holds the hearing, there would be opportunity for discussion.

The Agency members then had a discussion regarding whether to forward the plan to the Council or meet again. The question of whether the Council could hold the hearing without a recommendation from the Agency was raised. Kupper read the statute that there must be an action by the Agency forwarding the plan to the City Council.

City Administrator Eubank advised rather than acting on the committee, hold the public hearing and when it's finished, keep it open don't close the record. Then set a date and time to bring it back to finish

Turerk asked if the agency rubber stamps this, what else besides the size is set in stone?

Kupper advised there is no part of the plan that can not be changed by amendment. There is a process to follow to make amendments. It is very easy to make modifications. It is easy to reallocate, but it has to be with in the maximum indebtedness. Fleishman pointed out the section of the plan describing the different types of amendments.

Vigil moved and Wonderling seconded to forward the Urban Renewal Plan to the City Council with a recommendation of keeping the public hearing open until the Urban Renewal Agency has met in a work session, to go over the details. Motion Passed 5:0

The group agreed the next meeting will be Wednesday, June 17 at 6:15 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 7:18.